



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,347	08/03/2001	Kelso G. Sims	733.00067	7293

7590

04/15/2003

Richard S. Phillips
Wood, Phillips, VanSanten, Clark & Mortimer
Suite 3800
500 West Madison
Chicago, IL 60661-2511

EXAMINER

NASH, BRIAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3721

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,347

Applicant(s)

SIMS ET AL.

Examiner

Brian D Nash

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9,12 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8,10,11 and 13-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received 21 February 2003.

Examiner acknowledges amendments to claims 4, 7, and 12.

Drawings

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 12 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The type of tool mounted to the claimed tool mount does not further limit the structure of the tool mount.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3721

In claims 20-21 it is unclear what is meant by comprising a “vertical ball and screw” or a “scissors jack” on the base, i.e. no structure has been disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2, 9, 12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 3,360,176 to Gehl et al. Gehl discloses the same invention including a tool carrier (11) having a base (20,41) engaging the sub floor and a spacer (35) engaging the work piece; having a handle (23,24) extending upwardly from the tool carrier (11) at an angle.

Regarding structural limitations of a tool held in place by the tool mount, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3-8, 10-11, and 13-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 21 February 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends, *inter alia*, that Gehl does not perform the same function as the claimed invention. Examiner acknowledges applicant's position; however, a reference is deemed to properly anticipate a claim when all the recited limitations are disclosed therein. In this instance, Gehl clearly shows all the recited structural limitations including a tool carrier which can be adjusted vertically to position a tool vertically with respect to a work piece. The examiner notes that vertical adjustment is possible via the adjusting screws, the flange (28) and the yoke (27) as seen in Gehl, Fig. 4. While it is noted that the device of Gehl does not perform the same function as applicant's invention, it is deemed that the claims are not restrictive to such device.

Regarding claim 12, the examiner acknowledges and appreciates the clarification provided by the applicant and has withdrawn rejection to claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. However, applicant has stated that the limitations of claim 12 relate to a tool secured to the tool carrier and appropriately, in lieu of applicant's amendment, an objection to claim 12 has been made.

Regarding claims 17-19, the examiner refers to elements (23,24) as the handle of the tool mount (11) and not the nailing tool (12). The handle (23,24), in its broadest possible interpretation, is also a wand that both extends upwardly and away from at an angle of the order of 45 degrees. As noted above, the handle/wand (23,24) of Gehl is deemed to properly anticipate claims 17-19 since all the recited structural limitations are disclosed therein. In this instance, the

Art Unit: 3721

handle/wand (23,24) of Gehl clearly shows all the recited structural limitations and furthermore can be used to move the tool carrier across the floor by an operator.

Regarding claims 20-21, the examiner acknowledges reference to the terms “vertical ball and screw” and “scissors jack” on page 6, lines 17-18 of the specification, but notes that no further structural limitations have been presented in the claims.

For the reasons above, the grounds for rejection are deemed proper.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nickles Smith, Foray et al, Adams, Grasset, Buchler, Marron, Rees, and Otlman et al are cited to show related references.
10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3721

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Nash whose telephone number is (703) 305-4959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached at (703) 308-2187.

The fax numbers for this Group are:

Before Final	703-872-9302
After Final	703-872-9303
Customer Service	703-872-9301

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Brian D. Nash
7 April 2003



Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700